



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/697,734 | 10/29/2003 | Eugene Joseph Pancheri | 9399 | 7723 |

27752 7590 11/30/2005

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

LU, JIPING

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3749

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Taka

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/697,734 | Applicant(s) PANCHERI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Jiping Lu | Art Unit 3749 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,980,583 to Staub et al. in view of US Patent 5,985,385 to Gottfried.

Staub et al. teach a fabric article treating device comprising source 60 of a benefit composition (col. 5, ln. 55-56), dispensing means 52 (col. 5, ln. 12-14), and an insulating means for thermal protection on source 60 (col. 7, ln. 29-30). Staub et al. do not teach the thermal protection means having first, second, and third layers as presently claimed. Gottfried teaches a thermal protection wrapping system comprising four layers, one of which has low thermal conductivity and is sandwiched between two other layers (col. 4, ln. 25-30; col. 7, ln. 4-6). As Gottfried teaches that having his multi-layer system comprising one layer of low thermal conductivity leads to greater heat protection (col. 3, ln. 47-50), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the thermal protector of Staub et al. with the multi-layer thermal protector of Gottfried. Regarding the specific range of thermal conductivity claimed, Gottfried does not teach the exact level of thermal conductivity of his low thermal conductivity layer. However, such a limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art,

Art Unit: 3749

discovering the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Regarding claim 15, the low thermal conductivity layer taught by Gottfried is a solid (col. 7, ln. 6-10).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 9/16/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. First, broad claims fail to structurally define over the prior art references. Please point out from the claims any limitations that the references do not show or teach. Second, the applicant argues that the Staub patent teaches away from the broadly claim invention because Staub teaches the use of heat insulation to maintain heat. The applicant wants to use heat insulation to protect from heat. However, the examiner agrees with the applicant's intention but disagrees with the applicant's line of arguments. Regardless the purposes of the use of heat insulation, the fact the heat insulation is generally used to maintain heat or insulate heat or protect from heat is well known in the art. It should be noted that Staub does teach the use of heat insulation for protection of the contents of the chemical storage tank. Gottfried also teaches the multi-layer heat insulations construction same as the applicant's. Therefore, it is the examiner's position that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, in view of the combined teachings of the references, to modify the thermal protector of Staub et al. with the multi-layer thermal protector of Gottfried.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jiping Lu whose telephone number is 571 272 4878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, EHUD GARTENBERG can be reached on 571 272-4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3749

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Jiping Lu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3749

J.L.